DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 842 95 EA 007 903

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Handbook on How to End Sexism in Your Schools. A Position Paper Prepared by the National Conference on Women in Educational Policy Making. IEL Report 5. |
| INSTITUTION | George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | IEL-R-5 |
| PUB DATE | Oct 75 |
| NOTE | 55p.; Related documents are EA 007 902-904 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage |
| DESCRIPTORS | Administrative Personnel; Affirmative Action; Case Studies; *Change Strategies; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Federal Legislation; *Females; Feminism; Leadership Training; *Sex Discrimination; *Sex Stereotypes; Teacher Education; Textbook Content |

ABSTRACT

This booklet presents strategies for making changes in educational policy to eliminate sex discrimination against girls and women. The first step is to organize, or form a coalition of organizations that provides credibility and resources. Second, to establish the case, a number of practices are listed that evidence discrimination in the areas of curriculum materials, course offerings, guidance and counseling, athletics, teacher and staff behavior, pregnant students, and school staff. Third, procedures for filing complaints of legal noncompliance are outlined. The fourth strategy is a model of five important recommendations to be included in a letter to the chief state school officer. The final strategy involves focusing on local school superintendents and pressing for an affirmative action plan. The second part of the booklet is a brief description of affirmative action programs in Kalamazoo, Michigan, and, at the state level, in Pennsylvania. (MLP)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED117842

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# HANDBOOK ON HOW TO END SEXISM IN YOUR SCHOOLS

LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-9051

EA 007 903

IEL REPORTS: FIVE

Second Printing
OCTOBER 1975

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

ADVISORY BOARD

CHAIRPERSON – DR. BERNICE SANDLER
Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women
Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

K.Z. CHAVIS
Program Director
Leadership Development Program, Atlanta

DR. JOHN DAVIS
President, Macalester College
Saint Paul, Minnesota

DR. JOHN DUNWORTH
President
George Peabody College, Nashville

DR. LLOYD ELLIOTT
President
The George Washington University

DR. MICHAEL FAY
Director
United Teachers' Los Angeles Urban Project

FRANCIS KEPPEL
Director
Aspen Institute Education Program

HONORABLE HOWARD KLEBANOFF
Chairman, House Education Committee
Hartford, Connecticut

RUTH MANCUSO
Chairperson
New Jersey State Board of Education

RUBY G. MARTIN
General Counsel, Committee on the District of Columbia
U.S. House of Representatives

DR. LOUIS H. MAYO
Vice President for Policy Studies and Special Projects
The George Washington University

HARRY McPHERSON, JR.
Attorney, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE JOHN PITTENGER
Secretary of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

LOIS RICE
Vice President
College Entrance Examination Board

HONORABLE MARY RIEKE
Oregon State Representative

DR. ALAN ROSENTHAL
Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University

DR. PAUL B. SALMON
Executive Director
American Association of School Administrators

DR. RICHARD C. SNYDER
Mershon Professor of Education and Public Policy
Ohio State University

DR. CHARLES WATTS
President
Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

DR. PAUL N. YLVISAKER
Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education

INSTITUTE STAFF

SAMUEL HALPERIN – Director
DIETRA ROGERS – Chief Administrative Officer
JUNE FRANK – Budget Officer

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
GEORGE LANE – Director
SHARON ENRIGHT – Associate Director

THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM
JAMES BROWNE – Coordinator

EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
PAUL SCHINDLER – Director

"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION" OVER NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO
JOHN MERROW – Executive Producer

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY
KENNETH C. FISCHER – Director

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION
ALICE G. SARGENT – Coordinator

CAREER EDUCATION POLICY PROJECT
GEORGE KAPLAN – Coordinator

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

*Suite 310*
*1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.*
*Washington, D.C. 20036*

*Samuel Halperin*
*Director*
*(202) 833-1737*

*Education Policy*
*Fellowship Program*
*(202) 223-3415*

*Educational Staff Seminar*
*(202) 293-3166*

*The Associates Program*
*(202) 785-4991*

*Leadership Training Institute*
*(202) 833-9051*

*Postsecondary Education*
*Convening Authority*
*(202) 833-2745*

*"Options on Education"*
*over National*
*Public Radio*
*(202) 833-9178*

# HANDBOOK ON HOW TO END SEXISM IN YOUR SCHOOLS

A Position Paper Prepared by the
National Conference on Women
in Educational Policy Making

Leadership Training Institute
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-9051

IEL REPORTS: FIVE OCTOBER 1975

Distribution of this report is made possible by a contract with the Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The Leadership Training Institute (LTI) on educational leadership is an outgrowth of the 1969 Federal Education Professions Development Act. During the past five years the LTI has been concerned with a broad range of issues in educational leadership with particular emphasis on the development of internship programs in Six City-University Projects funded by USOE which have experimented extensively with the preparation and training of future educational leaders.

In its quest for more effective educational leadership, the LTI recognized in the early stages of its work the serious sparsity of Blacks, Spanish-Speaking, and American Indians within the ranks of educational leadership. One of our major objectives was to encourage the recruitment of minority candidates for our internship programs. In 1973 the LTI initiated several conferences to examine and evaluate the status of minorities in the area of school administration. A representative and distinguished group of leaders from each minority group was assembled and each group in turn planned the nature of its conference, the agenda, and its participants.

By 1973, the LTI recognized that in its preoccupation with greater representation in school administration by Blacks, Spanish-Speaking, and American Indians, we had neglected women, the group making up the largest portion of the education professions especially as teachers. A separate conference by women was therefore planned.

As one looks back at the 1960's and early 1970's, the ancient truism reappears -- that despite centuries or decades of oppression and stereotyping -- society still does not recognize that equality of opportunity, like liberty, is indivisible. When discrimination is practiced against any single individual or group, no one can be assured of equal treatment. As was the case with other victims of discrimination, women had to wage their own battle to gain equal treatment. Hopefully, the findings and recommendations developed by the various groups will awaken the educational bureaucracy to still existing, but disregarded injustices in other areas of the broad educational field. In schools, equal opportunity and treatment are not merely democratic issues, but the very touchstone of sound educational practice.

This publication is a statement developed by the conference on Women in Educational Policy Making held in Denver, Colorado, January, 1974. The Leadership Training Institute is very grateful to the members of the conference for their significant contribution to education and the area of school leadership. These findings and recommendations will be disseminated within the education professions and among those governmental agencies that are instrumental in shaping educational policy.

The LTI is especially grateful to Ms. Margery Thompson, who, as conference coordinator, writer and editor, has prepared the material, including this publication, which emerged from this conference.

Norman Drachler,
Director, Leadership
Training Institute

George R. Kaplan
Associate Director,
Leadership Training
Institute

This work was developed under a grant from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of that Agency, and no official endorsement of these materials should be inferred.

Part I of this booklet combines the work of two groups at the Conference:

Group I <u>Legal and Policy Requirements of Educational Systems</u>

Margaret Jones - Group Leader
Holly Knox - position paper
Catherine East
Margaret Gates
Margaret Dunkle
Carol Polowy

Group III <u>How Can State Action Plans Be Developed to Move Women Into Educational Policy-Making?</u>

Sara Zimet - Group Leader
Pam Root - position paper
Marj Britt
Patricia Chesebro
Jean L. Ambrose
Judith Edwards

Part II is based on documents describing affirmative action programs in a community and in a state -- Kalamazoo, Michigan and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It was written by Margery Thompson.

INDEX


Preface i

I. Part I - YOUR DAUGHTER AND DISCRIMINATION 1

What is Discrimination?
Changing Educational Policy -- Some Strategies for Action 2
1. Organize, Organize 2
2. Make Your Case 3
3. Filing Complaints for Non-Compliance 7
4. State Action Plan 8
5. Requests for Technical Assistance 12

II. TWO CASE STUDIES IN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION 16

1. The Kalamazoo Story 16
2. A State Model - Pennsylvania 23

Appendix A

Appendix B

## PART I

### YOUR DAUGHTER AND DISCRIMINATION--What You Can Do

You may have discovered already that your daughter does not have the same opportunities as boys in her school. If you are concerned that she--and other girls--are not receiving the full benefits of the education system your tax dollars support, you can do something about it. The law is on your side.

Such has not always been the case. No federal or uniform state legislation existed before 1972 to protect women in education from discrimination. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited discrimination in employment on the grounds of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin, but employees of state and local governments, as well as of educational institutions, were exempted. In 1972, Congress passed new laws and expanded upon older legislation to effectively prohibit discrimination against teachers and students because of their sex.

For example:

--Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits any school receiving federal money from denying benefits to or discriminating against female students and employees. Virtually all public schools receive federal money.

--States and local governments receiving revenue sharing funds under the State Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 may not discriminate on the basis of sex in the use of those funds.

--Two other amended federal laws--Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Pay Act of 1963--forbid school districts from discriminating against women in employment.

--Many states have an equal rights provision in their constitutions, fair employment practice laws, or equal opportunity laws which prohibit discrimination based on sex.

So there is ample justification now for citizen action should unequal treatment exist in your schools.

## WHAT IS DISCRIMINATION?

This is the question you must ask yourselves, for the first step to be taken is to identify the problem locally, and to identify it specifically. Illegal discrimination against girls and women takes many forms. Basically, discrimination means that a girl is treated differently from a boy, even if you can't absolutely prove that she suffers because of this different treatment. In a school setting, discrimination can be manifested in what a girl is taught, how she is taught it, and by whom.

## CHANGING EDUCATIONAL POLICY--SOME STRATEGIES FOR ACTION

A single person can be the starting point in a movement for change, but it's always good to have support. Moreover, change in education must be accomplished on many fronts if it is to be permanently woven into the fabric of the system. Much can be accomplished by local groups; more can be gained if they are acting in concert with state organizations, for it is at the state level that many decisions are taken which are binding on local school systems.

Accordingly, our strategies for action begin with those a local group can undertake, but they assume linkages with state organizations who can act on behalf of all community school systems within the state.

## STRATEGY ONE - ORGANIZE, ORGANIZE

You will be more apt to succeed in your efforts to end discrimination if you get a community organization--a women's organization, a church group, the PTA, YWCA, or a teacher's organization, to sponsor or help you. Better yet, try to form a coalition of such organizations. It can provide credibility and resources. Thus you can form an ad hoc committee of concerned citizens--parents, teachers or students. Enlist the help of as many influential members of

the community as possible. Keep an eye out for those groups in your town that are already affiliated with an active state organization which you can later enlist. In addition, you will need to identify the power sources in your school district. Some of these will be formal, others informal--and in your group someone will know someone who can help, if only to provide shortcuts in getting to the persons.

STRATEGY TWO - MAKE YOUR CASE

Whatever help you can secure from community groups or the school system, you'll need to get as much information as possible in documenting sex discrimination. But first, you will want to do a little spade work to learn what other groups have done or are doing. And it behooves any local group concerned with ending discrimination in its schools to be clear about who can decide what, for it is of no use to tell the local superintendent or the chief state school officer about a ruling that, in the end, is the prerogative of the state legislature. These powers vary from state to state, so it is a good idea to be clear about what your state department of education can do and what it cannot do for you, and where your local school superintendent can act unilaterally.

Whether or not you are working with a state organization, you will want information on discrimination as a case study, and a school system is the place to begin.

Here are some areas you can check for evidence of discrimination in your schools:

1. Curriculum materials

Do history and social science books feature the contributions of women?

Do curriculum materials show adult women in roles other than being a mother or teacher or nurse?

Do stories feature girls as heroines?

Are girls shown as often as boys as successful, imaginative or active?

2. Course offerings

Are girls allowed to take industrial arts classes?

Are boys allowed to take home economics?

Are required courses different for girls and boys?

Are any vocational courses offered to boys or to girls only?

Are some courses separated by sex? If so, what's the difference in what is being taught?

3. Guidance and counseling

Are messages--direct or implied--expressed by counselors that discourage girls or boys from taking particular courses?

Are girls advised to train for traditional female occupations such as secretary or bookkeeper while boys are encouraged to prepare for the traditional male occupations?

Do school personnel discourage girls from going to college because "they'll only be getting married anyway?"

Do the schools use vocational interest or aptitude tests that encourage sex-stereotyping?

4. Athletics

Are physical education classes segregated by sex? If so, is there a difference in what is taught?

Do girls have access to the facilities and equipment on an equal basis with boys?

Are boys' and girls' coaches and officials paid equally?

Can girls and boys play the same varsity sports? Junior varsity? Intramural?

How much does the school system spend per capita on girls' athletics compared with boys' athletics?

Can qualified girls play on teams with boys?

5. Teacher/staff behavior

Do teachers have activities designating only girls or only boys (e.g., "Let's have the girls bring the cookies," or "Let the boys play football during the picnic?")

Do teachers' expectations differ for boys and girls?

Do teachers or staff people use terms demeaning to girls (e.g., "chick," or "doll?")

6. Pregnant students

Does the school district force pregnant students to leave school, or exclude them from regular classes or activities?

7. School staff

What roles do women play within the school staff?

What proportion of the teachers at each level is female? Principals? Department heads? Superintendents? Other top administrative staff members?

Does the school system permit pregnant teachers to teach as long as they are able? Does the school system treat complications of pregnancy like any other temporary disability?

What are the average salaries of male teachers? Female teachers? Male administrators? Female administrators?

These are just examples of the practices you might want to explore to see where your schools stand. There are others you will perhaps think of, but in the main all you want to look for is "different treatment" accorded to one sex or the other.

Obtaining all of the information you want may be difficult. Be persistent. Remember, as a taxpayer you have a right to know what your school tax dollars are supporting. And most educators want to comply with the law. But they sometimes need citizen pressure to help them make major changes. Establish person-to-person contact with a responsible official through an interview or phone call to explain your purposes. It helps to write a follow up letter reviewing your conversations.

You must remember that both state and local governments are exempted under the Freedom of Information Act, so that access to this data will require cooperation from the school system and/or the local teachers group.

The following steps are suggestions on how to go about getting the information you need and what to do once you have identified a problem.

1. Interview school officials, teachers, and students. Keep accurate notes so that you can accurately reflect all viewpoints when you write a report.

2. Talk with a sympathetic school board member who would be interested in opportunities for girls. Raise the question of different treatment. Ask if board members are aware of other instances of discriminatory treatment or sex role stereotyping.

3. Obtain copies of the school budget and any Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) reports that list school personnel. Other reports, such as those on vocational education and attendance, may be important. (Unequal expenditures for sports are not an issue under Title XI guidelines unless girls are not provided uniforms and the like.)

4. Request information from the superintendent's office and meet with a knowledgeable member of his/her staff.

5. Write a report on your findings. Be precise and quote your sources, using their names whenever possible. Make specific recommendations so the school system will have something to answer. Request a written response.

6. Publicize your efforts. Send copies of your report to school officials, the school board, mayor, the local

media, and community groups, and to the Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, 1156 - 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, to help other groups just starting out.

7. Remember, <u>follow up is important</u>. Write letters to the editor of your newspaper, write your elected representatives, press the issue at school board meetings, offer to speak to the PTA and other group meetings.

8. You may want to file a complaint--and you should learn to understand this process. You have a right to request enforcement of the laws by filing a written complaint with federal or state officials. This procedure is briefly outlined below but you may also want to seek assistance from an attorney experienced in sex discrimination litigation or from women's groups or civil rights groups in your community.

<u>STRATEGY THREE - FILING COMPLAINTS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE</u>

If you find examples of legal non-compliance if your schools and no evidence of action or cooperation to change these practices, you can file a complaint against the local school district. This is also a way to create pressure for change at the state level. Complaints may be filed by an individual or by an organization so long as a compelling interest can be established. Those with a compelling interest are: (1) a resident of a local school district (not necessarily the parent of a child in school); and (2) an organization whose geographic area includes the district(s) in question (e.g., a county-wide organization may file a complaint anywhere within the county.)

As has been indicated, there are a number of laws under which a complaint may be filed; check for the most appropriate. Complaints may be filed with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare citing, for example, violation of Title IX and/or with the state agency empowered to enforce the state law against discrimination if such a law exists.

Such complaint is filed by writing to the appropriate agency (the Regional HEW office and/or the state agency for human rights) setting forth the area(s) of non-compliance. Documentation may assist the handling of your complaint but it is not absolutely necessary. (See Appendix B).

When you file your complaint, send copies to your representatives in Congress, state and local government, interested local groups and the press. You might issue a press release explaining why you filed the complaint. Make sure that the complaint shows that you sent carbon copies to these people so that the enforcement agency knows that many people are aware of the problems.

Once again, follow up is important. When you write to a federal agency, you should expect a letter of response from a compliance officer within a few weeks. If you don't get a response, write again or ask your Congressman to write. The officer, who may be at your regional office, may tell you that an investigation is scheduled. Keep in touch with this person to be sure that your case is being given attention and to find out what the agency intends to do about the discrimination they find.

An appropriate result for a local school system would be to create a staff to develop a program for affirmative action.

STRATEGY FOUR - STATE ACTION PLAN

You may choose to gather information in your own district but carry out your action plans at the state level. If so, you or members of your group should individually and/or collectively write to your chief state school officer stating in detail what he/she can do now to eliminate sex discrimination in education in the schools of your state. A model of such a letter contains five important recommendations. Briefly, those recommendations request the chief state school officer to:

1. develop a policy statement on the elimination of sex-role stereotyping, indicating it to be a high priority goal.

2. develop an affirmative action plan for the department of education.

3. require all local districts to submit an affirmative action plan.

4. include in school accreditation or funding requirements documented evidence that sex discriminatory practices are not maintained in a district.

5. appoint a task force on girls and women in education to conduct a study on discriminatory practices, review educational policy, and practice, and monitor progress.

The next action step you or your group can take is to personally follow up on this letter to see that the chief state school officer does indeed carry out each of these crucial recommendations.

Not all chief state school officers can mandate affirmative action plans, nor can they require compliance with non-discriminatory practices as a condition of the receipt of state funds. In many cases, these can only be mandated by the governor, or by the state legislature. But where this is true, you can ask your chief state school officer for and keep working to get affirmation of a strong clear policy guiding decisions and action in the state department of education. Excepting the above, the recommendations cited here are actions that a chief state school officer can take without approval from any other persons or agency, without fear of political reprisal, and without a great deal of time, money, or effort. And they are actions that promise a significant impact on the elimination of sex-role stereotyping and discrimination in pre-school, elementary, secondary, vocational, and, in some instances, higher education.

Implementing Strategy Four: Arrange to meet with the chief state school officer to elaborate on each of the recommendations or provide him/her with sample documents to make the task easier. To further that end:

1. Develop a strong, clear policy statement. This is the first step in establishing leadership and puts the state on record as being committed to developing equal educational opportunity. The statement gives local school administrators a general outline of what is expected of them in this area. It need not be lengthy. A good example of such is included in the Pennsylvania case study (p. 23).

2. Establish a statewide task force. The work of this task force will lead to specific recommendations for action on the part of the chief state school officer and the

state department of education. The recommendations may include the establishment of an Office for Women's Rights in the state department of education.

You can help sharpen the focus of such a Task Force by indicating which of a number of areas covered by the umbrella of equal educational opportunity your group sees as a top priority. Are you most concerned about equal opportunity in employment? In program development and curricula? Or in the organization and decision-making of the state department itself?

3. Develop an affirmative action plan for employment within the state education agency. Affirmative action represents a commitment to correct the effects of previous discriminatory employment practices and is the major first step in moving to eliminate discrimination based on sex and race. A state department of education must set an example if it is to provide leadership. Remember, a Task Force or community group might monitor action on this.

4. Where possible, mandate affirmative action programs for all school districts. A rationale for state departments of education--or state legislatures--for making this requirement is:

a) Affirmative action is an acknowledged technique for remediating findings of discrimination.

b) All state departments are or should be concerned. Affirmative action is a concrete method of ensuring equality of opportunity in employment and compliance with the letter and spirit of the law of the land.

c) It is to the benefit of the employer to demonstrate this compliance through an easily monitored guide such as a published affirmative action plan, as a means of planning change rationally and in an orderly fashion, rather than via crisis orientation.

d) a few school districts will have to have mandates if they receive more than $50,000 federal contract funds in their district.

e) Since the state departments of education make requirements for approval for federal funds and for allocation of state money, they could also make the requirement for an affirmative action plan. As noted above, this is a function shared with state legislatures in many states and does not apply to every state department of education.

5. Require documented evidence of compliance with Title IX of the 1972 Education Acts as a part of the Allocation process. Although many school districts are moving to integrate classes such as home economics, industrial arts, and physical education, and to eliminate differential graduation requirements (e.g., a year of home economics for girls and a year of industrial arts for boys), there are many schools where these practices continue in open violation of the law. By requiring documented evidence of compliance in order to qualify for state funds, the chief state school officer ensures compliance in every district.

6. Follow up on your efforts to ensure that the chief state school officer will implement the recommendations outlined in the letter. It may require a letter-writing campaign (with copies to the press); a request to be placed on the agenda for a meeting of the state board of education; a visit to the chief state school officer by a committee representing several professional education and/or women's groups; or you may wish to find a sympathetic person with the state department of education to carry your messages to the chief state school officer.

State legislators who are sympathetic and understand these issues can be extremely effective in getting the attention of the chief state school officer, since the legislature appropriates the funds with which the state department of education operates. Some of your recommendations, indeed, may require legislation to become operative.

At the same time you are following up on the recommendations outlined in the letter, one or more communities can pressure the chief state school officer from the local level by requests to the state department of education for technical assistance in developing affirmative action plans (or filing non-compliance complaints).

STRATEGY FIVE - REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR DEVELOPING AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN

This strategy exerts pressure on the chief state school officer to develop guidelines that will bring districts into compliance with federal laws prohibiting sex discrimination. The focal point for this pressure is your local school superintendent. You want to (1) create a need (expressed through requests from the local school superintendent for these guidelines); and (2) create a mechanism (such as a women's office) to respond to this need.

In the preceding section, the need to form local coalitions for community action has been stressed; this is even more important when one wants to bring about change at the state level. Sponsoring groups with statewide affiliates and a state headquarters are the ones to interest in your effort. This is simple common sense, for your citizen's group picks up strength and experience through such a collaboration. It is realistic as well, for while your own community will benefit from the development and application of proper guidelines, you will be working on behalf of all communities in your state.

Focussing on local school superintendents and pressing for an affirmative action plan has been used effectively in several states. It works because your school board and superintendent must be responsive to community needs and aware that federal funds to your district can be frozen as a result of court action against the district for discriminatory practices. Affirmative action plans were chosen as a target, as stated elsewhere, because: (1) they are concrete; (2) they are easily evaluated; (3) there is authority and a strong precedent for them; and (4) they provide a mechanism for open assessment of problems and monitoring of progress which is not available in the collective bargaining process.

Implementing Strategy Five: Briefly outlined below are some steps you can take to generate as much pressure as possible to support your request for technical assistance. But before you proceed with any of them, be clear about the level of activity in your own state--and community--including the state laws and regulations which govern the authority of your state superintendent and your local school board. The latter is especially relevant with regard to Step 1.

The steps suggested begin with those you can take locally and are followed by those which would be most effective if done through a state organization or in collaboration with state and local affiliates.

Local Action

1. School boards cannot interfere with collective bargaining. (Indeed, neither can you.) Approach your local teachers' group about the legality of their collective bargaining agreements. You will learn what is or can be handled by them through this avenue and what you can do as a citizen group.

2. Arm yourself with the school district data--outlined earlier.

3. Ask to be placed on the agenda for a school board meeting and prior to the meeting lobby for passage of an affirmative action plan motion with school board members. Use your data.

4. Or, request that the school board introduce a motion that an affirmative action plan be drawn up. Attend the meeting with all the supporters you can find, and armed with your data. Be prepared.

5. If the affirmative action plan is passed, request that your group be represented on the district's Task Force, Committee, or Citizen's group. If it is not, keep bringing the issue up until the motion is passed. Do not give up on one try.

6. At the first meeting of this Task Force, get your representative to have the group write to the chief state school officer requesting technical assistance in writing the affirmative action plan. If there is no response or an unsatisfactory one, continued pressure by letter and by telephone is in order.

State Action or State/Local

7. Communicate information among sympathetic women's groups and school district personnel in neighboring school districts to help them to do the same thing you are doing. Move from district to district to generate as many requests for technical assistance as possible.

8. Select school districts with women's groups sympathetic toward women's rights as your targets.

9. If your state sets up a Commission or a special office concerned with equal rights for women, work to insure its effectiveness by recommending that its staffing is adequate and its responsibilities are sufficiently broad:

Staffing: The director should be a woman who has demonstrated an interest in women's rights; be provided with a staff and budget to carry out fully the responsibilities of the office; be assured of a policy-making role; and report directly to the chief state school officer.

Areas of Responsibility: To further insure that the office will be more than a gesture, the following outline of responsibilities should be included:

Development of an affirmative action plan for the state department of education.

Development of a model affirmative action plan for local school districts.

Development of state guidelines for adoption of non-sexist curriculum materials.

Encouragement of publishers and curriculum specialists at universities to develop non-sexist curriculum materials.

Establishment of a clearinghouse of non-sexist curriculum materials.

Encouragement of publishers and curriculum specialists at universities to develop compensatory curriculum, such as for women's studies and women in history. Some textbooks are mandated in which case the State Textbook and State Curriculum Committee must be involved.

Promote in-service staff sessions to identify sexist curriculum and to study the effects of sex role stereotyping in education.

Review procedures of the state department of education and monitor local districts for possible violations.

Identify competent women in education throughout the state and maintain an updated file for potential employers.

Work toward increasing the number of women qualified to be administrators through establishment of internships, cooperative programs with schools of education, and establishing competency-based criteria for certification.

Disseminate information relating to women's rights.

This section has attempted to outline some of the ways to help end sex discrimination in education. As an outline for action it is not meant to be complete or comprehensive. The particular kind of action that will ensue will differ from state to state, depending on the nature of the educational structure and the grassroots involvement. But the techniques do work, as witnessed by the model programs in Kalamazoo, Michigan and, at the state level, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. A brief description of how these programs developed follows.

## PART II

## TWO CASE STUDIES IN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Although only two examples are presented here, the case studies selected illustrate, we believe, nearly every component stressed in the preceding pages and necessary for a successful effort to combat sexism in education.

Kalamazoo, Michigan is strong in citizen action and though activities in that city to correct prejudicial content in texts have already been well-reported, the story is worth repeating. Moreover, recent progress in Kalamazoo moves ahead another chapter to other areas of the curriculum than the reading program.

There is no stronger state model than that represented by the Pennsylvania experience. The role of citizen action groups is apparent in preparing the way, but the model described points up the effectiveness of combined forces. Moreover, it emphasizes the effect of strong leadership throughout the State Department of Education.

The descriptions are drawn from documents in the case supplemented by interviews. At the end of each section are lists of reports available from the Kalamazoo School System and the Pennsylvania State Department of Education, should further information be desired.

### The Kalamazoo Story

Kalamazoo, Michigan is justly famous in the women's movement and among enlightened educators for the vast changes that are occurring there to halt sexism in the schools. It is perhaps most widely known as the source of the first administrative complaint alleging sex discrimination in textbooks to be filed under Federal law, in May 1973, but activity neither began then nor is it by any means confined to the area of reading. That sustained citizen action has been the driving force behind this change is our concern and progress in Kalamazoo is described here in those terms.

The Committee to Study Sex Discrimination

This committee was created by the Kalamazoo School Board as the result of citizen action in 1971. Asked to document sex discrimination before the Board would consider it as an issue, representatives of the women's movement in Kalamazoo returned in force to the next Board meeting in December 1971 with a telling slideshow on sexism in the elementary reading series (Scott, Foreman) then in use in the Kalamazoo schools.

The Board promptly established the study group, whose members were recruited by a Board-appointed chairman--the narrator of the slide show. The core of the Committee numbers about 20 parents of school children and other interested women but has involved more than 200 in its work.

In successive stages during the next two years, the Committee studied and documented sex discrimination in the Kalamazoo schools in physical education and sports, employment, curriculum, and elementary textbooks purchased by the Kalamazoo Board of Education for long-term, system-wide use, and in non-academic student concerns.

Since reports in each of the above areas included recommendations for action to correct discriminatory content or practices, presentation of the findings was followed up by meetings with appropriate school staff (and the Superintendent) to discuss implementation.

It was on that rocky road between "studying" and "implementing" that the Committee and the School Board ultimately came to a formal parting of their ways. The Committee viewed itself as considerably beyond that of a mere advisory body. Though established by the School Board, it was by no means co-opted by them but retained its identity as a citizen action group. This was to cause some misunderstanding and even anger among school people when the textbook complaint was filed.

The Committee Files a Complaint

Having begun its existence through a documentation of sexism in textbooks, the Committee was naturally alert to the possibilities for improvement when members learned that the Kalamazoo School Board was considering adoption of new elementary reading texts.

The series being considered were 12 texts published by Houghton Mifflin Company of Boston, Massachusetts. While the Board considered, the Committee began its study of each book, section by section and also observed aggregate phenomena across all the textbooks. Their analysis showed that sex discrimination in the textbooks was extensive, and little different than the Scott Foresman books they were to replace.

After a preliminary review, the Committee recommended that the Board postpone action. They proposed a temporary solution through purchase of supplementary materials 1) to enable the system to develop its own non-sexist reading program and 2) to put consumer pressure on the publisher. They also indicated in writing that a complaint would follow upon non-compliance.

Notwithstanding the Committee's presentation and request, the Board authorized purchase of the Houghton Mifflin elementary reading program for system-wide use in Grades One through Six.

On May 29, 1973, on the advice and with the assistance of counsel, the Committee filed a formal complaint and a preliminary report with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

Much has stemmed from this single act and the documents in the case may provide sound examples for interested groups to follow, so they are reproduced in toto in Appendix B.

The disposition of this complaint is still in limbo, for guidelines for Title IX were not available at the time of the filing and indeed have yet to clear the Congress as this goes to press. Merely filing the complaint, however, precipitated considerable action on the part of the Superintendent and the School Board in Kalamazoo.

Though the Committee was formally discharged by the Board in October 1973, having in its view completed the tasks and reports assigned, this had little effect on CSSD activities. Following is a description of these and the aftermath of the first non-compliance complaint.

Pressure Results in Change

Although filing of the complaint troubled some school people, the general reaction was positive and rapid. At the request of school administrators, a Materials Review Committee was established by the School Board to review the new reading program for sex bias. Feminist representatives worked with teachers and administrators during the summer of 1973 to produce revisions of the teachers' guide to the reading series such as the Committee had proposed.

Neither did the Committee's intent to exert consumer pressure go unheeded by the publishers. A meeting with the Materials Review Committee to hear its complaints convinced the editor-in-chief of Houghton Mifflin's reading and language arts department of the necessity to educate his own staff about sex-role stereotypes. He also developed plans to incorporate some of the Review Committee's revisions in Houghton Mifflin's annual revisions of the teachers' guides.

In the Fall of 1974, the Committee asked the Kalamazoo Schools to comply with the law (Title IX and the Michigan Public Accommodations Act) regarding classes sex-segregated by design. The violation cited was in home economics, where seventh grade home economics was sex-segregated intentionally in three out of five junior high schools.

This time the system did comply and letters were sent to parents announcing home economics classes open to both sexes. A new curriculum, re-education of teachers, and a new name--Human Ecology--were the mechanism used in Kalamazoo not only to open but to attract both sexes to home economics programs.

In January 1974, the Committee filed a complaint, again directly to the school system, about the sex-discriminatory physical education program and again with positive results.

The previous fall, as their "study and report" period with the School Board ended, the Committee called for a systematic and long-range program to end sexism in the following statement to the Board:

> The Committee recognizes that the administration and staff have achieved a higher level of awareness over the past two years and that certain steps have

> been taken to begin the process of eliminating sex discrimination in our school system. We take considerable pride in the fact that it is the Kalamazoo Public School System which is considered as the model for schools across the country, being recognized for its leadership in bringing about the elimination of sex discrimination in public education. However, the pervasiveness of institutionalized sexism and its damaging effects on our young people mean that these beginning steps already taken must be expanded into a thoughtfully planned program to eliminate sex discrimination in our schools, with evaluation and accountability as an important part of this program as any other.

The immediate response was polite but not forceful--the Superintendent announced that he recognized the Committee's work and that he would continue to welcome them as he would any community group interested in working with the schools toward common ends. Ultimately, however, the Committee received the commitment to a long-range, sustained program to end sexism it had requested.

The Superintendent stipulated this goal as one of high priority personally and directed all school staff to consider it as their objective as well.

Recommendations for Eliminating Sex Discrimination in the Reading Program, the guidelines developed by the Materials Review Committee, have been in use since September 1973. This Committee also reviews all materials for sex-stereotyped content before purchase by the school system.

Beginning in the fall of 1974 and meeting every other week, an administrative committee of the school system and the chairman of the Citizens Committee--Jo Jacobs--has been developing an affirmative action program for the schools of Kalamazoo covering the curriculum K-12. The document will be completed by the end of the school year (1975) and according to Ms. Jacobs progress thus far promises that it will indeed be a model program in all ways.

Concurrently, elementary and secondary principals and teachers have met to discuss sex-stereotyping and to introduce revisions in the curriculum already decided upon in course guidelines.

As is evident, the Committee now operates in a very responsive atmosphere, but it will continue to resort to pressure when that becomes necessary. In addition to work with the Kalamazoo schools, some recent activities of Committee members include cooperating with the Kalamazoo City Teacher's Association and the Michigan Intermediate School District (nine school systems) in developing workshops on sexism for teachers. As a pioneer, Jo Jacobs represents the group on the board of a national organization concerned with monitoring Title IX Guidelines, the Project on Equal Education Rights (PEER).

The Committee has been able to convince the school administration, finally, that it acted not as an adversary but toward a common goal of providing Kalamazoo's school children with the best possible education. Also, one can only agree that it was successful in another aim according to Ms. Jacobs when it filed the original complaint, "to be supportive of other sisters... to give others a model of what can be done."

Resource Materials

The final study on the Houghton-Mifflin Elementary Reading Program, 1971 edition, entitled "Sex Discrimination in an Elementary Reading Program," 1974, by the CSSD is available free of charge from the Michigan Women's Commission, 230 N. Washington Street, Lansing, Michigan 48933.

The following publications on sex discrimination are available from the following address: Kalamazoo Public Schools, Instructional Media Department, 1220 Howard Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008. Please forward either a purchase order or check for prepayment.

COMMITTEE TO STUDY SEX DISCRIMINATION IN THE KALAMAZOO PUBLIC SCHOOLS PUBLICATIONS (CSSD)

Report of the Task Force on Elementary Textbooks, 1973. ($1.00)

Report of the Task Force on Personnel Practices, 1973. ($1.00)

Report of the Task Force on Physical Education/ Athletics, 1973. ($1.00)

Report of the Task Force on Selected Secondary Studies. (A look at some of those value-forming content areas at the secondary level; for example, selected courses in history, home and family living, psychology, etc.), 1973. ($1.00)

Report of the Task Force on Student Oriented (non-academic) Concerns, (A look at the extra-curricular activities at the secondary level excluding athletics.) 1973. ($1.00)

KALAMAZOO PUBLIC SCHOOLS PUBLICATIONS

Elementary Department

Recommendations for Eliminating Sex Discrimination in the Elementary Reading Program, 1973. ($4.50)

Instructional Management Division

Recommendations for Eliminating Sex and Racial Discrimination in the Instructional Program, K-12, An Affirmative Action Program - DRAFT - 1974. ($1.50)

Instructional Media Department

Guidelines for the Evaluation of Print and Non-Print Materials, 1973. ($ .10)

70 Plus - A Framework for Non-Stereotyped Human Role in Media Center Materials, An Annotated Bibliography, 1974. ($ .15)

Loy Norrix High School Media Center

Notable Women of Science, a beginning listing and bibliography, 1974. ($ .35)

## A State Model - Pennsylvania

In the preface of a Joint Task Force on Sexism in Education report to the Pennsylvania Department of Education, there is a statement that says:

> ...the development of the report, combined with the implementation of its recommendations is an exercise of Pennsylvania's leadership role in education on a national scale. The Joint Task Force also serves to exemplify interagency cooperation as well as illustrate how a community group can work with the bureaucratic structure to achieve a desired end.

This claim is not an immodest one, for it is no more than the truth. In fact, one can say that the whole populace was involved, for the beginning of Pennsylvania's giant strides to end sexism was in the voting booth.

In May 1971 the people of Pennsylvania voted that Article I, Paragraph 26 be added to the Commonwealth's Constitution:

> Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania because of the sex of the individual.

How that amendment appeared on the ballot is not our concern here, but one can safely say it did not come out of a vacuum. The vote was in but no implementation procedures were established, so delegates from Pennsylvanians for Women's Rights, a coalition of 42 women's rights groups in Pennsylvania called on the Governor. They requested the Pennsylvania Department of Education to establish a Joint Task Force to develop policies and programs which would eliminate systematic sex discrimination in the Commonwealth's schools. Shortly thereafter, Governor Milton J. Shapp stated in Executive Directive 13 that "a major effort will be exerted to end discrimination against women and members of all minority groups..."

The Joint Task Force on Sexism in Education

Meeting for the first time on July 15, 1971, the Task Force prepared itself for a year's work. Members included representatives of a number of women's groups through the Pennsylvanians for Women's Rights (American Association of University Women, the Commission on the Status for Women, and the Women's Equity Action League and others). The Pennsylvania Department of Education leadership participants were coordinated by the assistant commissioners of basic and higher education and the third group included came from the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission.

During their deliberations, a new Commissioner of Education, John C. Pittinger, assumed office and quickly confirmed his predecessor's commitment to the work of the Task Force as a high priority. Among other actions, he distributed the following memo to all PDE employees on the subject of equal opportunity:

> ...I pledge myself and ask every employee to be alert to ways in which equal opportunity for women and members of racial minorities may be encouraged in local school districts, colleges and universities, and private agencies with whom the department contracts for services of any kind.

Under their over-all goal to eliminate sexism in education, the Task Force established seven sub-goals and committees, each committee being chaired by a staff member of the Department of Education:

1. Women's Studies in Basic and Higher Education
2. Guidance and Counseling
3. Sex-segregated Classes
4. Sexism in Textbooks and Library Materials
5. Basic Education Evaluation
6. Teacher Training
7. Continued Education for Women

The final report of the Task Force, published in August, 1972 included the concrete problems of sexism identified by each committee, the policy changes they recommended and the programs they suggested to implement these policies, plus some executive action the Secretary could take.

## Teacher Training and Sexism

Of the above sub-groups, that on teacher training can serve to illustrate how the Task Force went about its work and in what detail it covered the problem--in this instance one of the more crucial ones to be met.

The Joint Task Force recognized that, while textbooks and instructional material need correction, the attitudes and actions of the teacher play an equally vital part in the student's development and self-image. They believed it was necessary, therefore, to develop some interventionist studies and experiences for prospective teachers and in-service teachers in order to break the cyclical patterns of prejudice and negative learning environments that prevail.

A strategy called "intergroup education" was developed to combat the problem. Basically, it is designed to sensitize teachers to the problems of those with minority status (including, of course, women) and to equip them with skills to help their students overcome negative feelings about themselves and the negative atmosphere which keeps women and minority persons in jobs below par.

The Task Force sub-committee, in developing an implementation program for this strategy, started out with two concerns: 1) that the Policies, Procedures and Standard for Certification of Professional School Personnel of the Department of Education be amended to allow for intergroup education, i.e.

> Standard XIV will be amended to read: 'The program shall include intergroup content (race, religion, ethnic, socio-economic and sex) and experiences which encourage intellectual awareness of and emotional sensitivity to the cultural pluralism of our schools and society.'

and 2) that appropriate people would be identified to assist in program approval processes. To that end, the Subcommittee asked that the Pennsylvanians for Women's Rights prepare a list of names of individuals from elementary schools, secondary schools, and colleges who would be capable of serving in a dual capacity on program approval teams--as feminists and as professionals in teacher education.

By the time the Task Force report was published, the subcommittee on Teacher Training could report the following accomplishments:

1. A position paper of Pennsylvanians for Women's Rights (PWR) was presented to the First Annual Teacher Conference, September 23-24, 1971. A Committee studied the proposal and submitted recommendations. Recommendations were forwarded to faculties of teacher-preparing institutions for reaction.

2. The PWR position paper was presented to Graduate Deans of the state colleges. Reaction was positive. They requested additional assistance in the form of guidelines.

3. Standard XIV was carefully studied and found to be satisfactory as stated; however, a position paper was jointly prepared by personnel of the Division of Intergroup and Civil Rights Education and the Division of Teacher Education. This position paper was presented to the Professional Standards Committee, February 3-4, 1972. The committee endorsed the concept and approved the paper as "Program Approval Guidelines for Intergroup Education."

4. At the request of the Division of Teacher Education, PWR and the Division of Intergroup and Civil Rights Education prepared extensive lists of names of individuals who were recommended for inclusion on program approval on-site evaluation teams. Personal data forms were mailed to these individuals and when feasible, teams now include members with intergroup and feminist perspectives.

5. Joint meetings of PWR, Division of Intergroup and Civil Rights Education, Pennsylvania Human Rights Commission (PHRC) and Division of Teacher Education representatives have explored and accepted the feminist concerns as part of the intergroup concept. Program implementation will proceed in all areas related to intergroup: sex, race, religion, ethnic and socio-economic.

6. Plans for implementing the "Guidelines" for in-service education of teachers have been formulated.

The Task Force concluded its report with some recommendations for action by the Secretary.

1. Propose amendments to regulations 7.151 and 7.154 for State Board of Education approval. (re: curriculum and teacher education.)

2. Direct each school district and institution of higher education to implement the recommended policies established in conjunction with the Equal Rights Amendment to the Pennsylvania Constitution and the School Codes.

3. Direct each bureau to make a statement of policies and to develop materials within its area of responsibility.

4. Allocate funds or direct Bureau directors to reallocate funds, for publications, special programs, etc., needed to implement the policies to eliminate sexism in the schools.

5. Direct that all evaluation programs and guidelines include provision for full implementation of equal opportunity.

6. Assure that evaluation programs give the force of law to the required criteria by strengthening the procedure for revoking or refusing licenses, approvals, and funding.

7. Designate a staff person to coordinate the activities engendered by the recommendations of the Joint Task Force on Sexism in Education.

8. Set an example for affirmative action in department hiring, training and promoting qualified women and minority persons.

9. Provide for coordination of continuing education programs.

10. Provide for the coordination of research and statistical projects and for the use of this information in the planning and implementation of programs (including the evaluation programs) to eliminate sexist and racist practices.

The Task Force also pointed out that the content of its report, specific recommendations for policy and programs, must be viewed in the light of the Constitutional and legal rights and responsibilities established by the legislative and judicial system, and cited relevant federal and state laws and executive orders.

Implementing the Task Force Report

An Implementation and Evaluation Committee was established to oversee the continuing work toward attaining the goals of the Joint Task Force. The Secretary also agreed to have a member of his staff provide the guiding staff work necessary to the committee. This ongoing group meets quarterly, chaired by the Deputy Secretary. Like the original Task Force, it is a joint committee and representatives of women's groups continue to make their contribution.

In the fall of 1972, in a reorganization of the Department of Education, three new entities were created: the Office of Equal Rights in Basic Education and the Office of Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, plus an affirmative action office for internal recruitment, hiring and promotion. Later, two staff people were added to the Equal Rights offices to meet new needs without slighting prior activities concerned with other minorities.

At about that time, Secretary Pittinger addressed the following memoranda to his staff:

To Chief School Administrators
Intermediate Unit Executive Directors

The policies which I have established and upon which the public schools in the Commonwealth will be evaluated are that:

1. Sex-segregated and sex-stereotyped classes, programs, activities, and courses of study be eliminated.

2. Feminist literature be included in school libraries and efforts be made to secure instructional materials, including textbooks, which favorably portray women in non-traditional roles.

3. All students be counseled to consider a variety of career opportunities, not only those traditionally entered by persons of their sex.

4. Job placement practices assure students of employment opportunities without restriction because of sex.

5. Annual goals be set for hiring, training and promoting women of all races at every level of employment.

6. The role of women becomes an integral part of the school curriculum.

I recommend you develop programs, if you have not already done so, such as the following to support these policies:

1. Sensitize all staff to sexism and to what are degrading and discriminatory practices.

2. Eliminate sex-stereotyped roles in all school publications.

3. Eliminate assignments by sex in all job classes and student positions.

4. Seek the establishment of child care/ development programs for children of staff, faculty and students, with costs according to ability to pay. These programs can be used for training the students in child care and family relationships.

5. Provide before and after school programs especially for children whose parents work.

6. Provide a sex education course in human growth and development which includes emotional and physical growth and interpersonal relationships.

I have directed the staff of the Department of Education to consider the elimination of sexism an important part of their responsibilities. They will provide you with technical assistance and advisory services.

All such programs hinge on a satisfactory evaluation system. Therefore, I assure you that the Department will fulfill its evaluation responsibilities in accord with procedures which will be clearly stated.

I seek your cooperation in meeting our joint responsibility to eliminate discriminatory practices in the schools of the Commonwealth.

To University and College Presidents and Deans
State-owned and State-related

I have committed the Department of Education to making the elimination of sexism in education a priority. This is in accordance with the amendment to Article I of the Constitution of the Commonwealth and in keeping with the policy of Governor Milton J. Shapp, as set forth in Executive Directive 13, which states, "A major effort will be exerted to end discrimination against all minority groups and women...."

In order to meet this commitment, I hereby request that you make plans immediately to carry out the policies embodied in the Constitutional Amendment and in Executive Directive 13 as follows:

1. Eliminate sex-segregated classes, programs, activities and courses of study.

2. Eliminate special rules for women or men (housing, hours, athletics, jobs, etc.)

3. Establish the same admission qualifications for women and men except where these are shown to discriminate against women or men.

4. Library and course materials should include information on women, presentation of women role-models and feminist perspectives of history, psychology, sociology, politics, economics and law.

5. Annual goals be set for hiring, training and promoting women of all races and all ages at every level of employment.

6. Develop women's studies as an integral part of the curriculum.

I recommend that you develop programs such as the following to implement these policies:

1. Child Care/Development Programs for children of staff, faculty and students, with costs according to ability to pay.

2. Staff and faculty should reflect the same balance by sex and race in each job class at all employment levels (including administration) as the Commonwealth's general labor force.

The memorandums have been quoted in full here to illustrate the kind of direct action and support a state superintendent can give to such a group as the Task Force.

From 1972 to the present, Pennsylvania has moved on many fronts to make their goals of equality a reality. Since some of the plans in teacher training were the earliest to be effected, we can best begin by describing developments in this area.

## Teacher Training

The annual curriculum conference in Shippensburg, Pennsylvania in June, 1972 included a workshop jointly sponsored by the Division of Intergroup and Civil Rights Education and the Division of Teacher Education of the Pennsylvania Department of Education. The workshop was designed to:

... determine the problems attendant on initiation of in-service programs in intergroup education for school personnel;

... develop strategies for overcoming the identified problems; and

... stimulate the initiation of cooperative in-service programs in intergroup education among institutions of higher education and local school districts.

The 1973 Shippensburg Conference also featured equal rights activities and in August, 1973, a statewide conference on sexism was held for school personnel, community organizations, parents, students, and interested students with an attendance of well over one hundred persons.

In addition to statewide meetings, six workshops for administrators and regional intermediate units (the old county offices) were held in November and December 1974.

Concurrently, during 1974, Equal Rights and Intergroup Education Curriculum -- Practical Exercises for Teachers K-12 was prepared by the State Department. A copy of this document was sent to each school district as a guide, an indication that there has to be an ongoing implementation program, and that help is forthcoming from the State.

## Curriculum

In 1973, the Pennsylvania Department of Justice filed a suit against the Pennsylvania Inter-Scholastic Association under the Equal Rights Amendment of the Commonwealth Constitution. The Association is the group controlling interscholastic events and the action was based on their by-law which prohibited mixed competition.

Related to that action was one taken by the State Board of Education when they adopted new health, and physical education curriculum regulations. These which, in effect, were to assure equal opportunity for girls in athletic programs. Passed in September, 1974, to be implemented in July 1975, the regulations guarantee equal access to girls:

> "Each school district shall develop and conduct...a program of intramural activities for all upper grade elementary students (4-6) and all secondary students...at a level appropriate to their interest and ability.
>
> The plans shall insure that the intramural program provides all boys and girls with equal access to: 1) school facilities; 2) appropriate instruction; 3) scheduled program time; 4) number of activities; 5) equipment, supplies and services; 6) coeducational activities; and funding appropriate to the sport.

The interscholastic regulation requires that a separate program of interscholastic athletics be available to boys and girls which provide:

> "1) equal access to coaching and instruction; 2) schedule and practice time; 3) number of activities at each level of competition; 4) equal access to supplies and services, and 5) funding appropriate to the sport. The program <u>may</u> also sponsor coeducational competition (i.e. relay teams, swimming). No rules may be imposed that exclude girls from trying out for, practicing with, or competing for boys' interscholastic teams.

Earlier, in 1973, curriculum regulations were amended to include women in two related regulations:

1) In each social studies program in elementary and secondary schools of the Commonwealth there shall be included the active roles and contributions of women, minority, and racial and ethnic groups in the history of the United States and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

2) The instructional program of every school shall include intergroup concepts which are designed to improve students' understanding and relationships between individuals in groups of different sexes, races, national origin, religions and socio-economic backgrounds."

A follow up to this, in 1974 the State Board of Education passed long-range plan regulations which would include an equal opportunity section for every school district in the Commonwealth. Pennsylvania has 505 school districts. Implementation of these plans means that in a 5 year cycle, beginning in September 1976, 100 school districts a year will be developing programs to conform with the regulations.

A State Committed to Change

The key to the success of the Joint Task Force on Sexism in Education is the multi-level cooperation existing among the citizenry community groups, state and local school officials, and the leadership provided by the Secretary of Education and the Governor.

... The citizens of Pennsylvania voted for an Equal Rights Amendment.

... Community groups and state officials helped to implement this Amendment by establishing a Joint Task Force.

... The Secretary of Education followed through.

... An ongoing Implementation and Evaluation Committee continued to monitor progress and to provide a vehicle for participation by women's groups.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has, indeed, set an example for the rest of the country and while the going might not be so smooth elsewhere, at all times, what has happened and is happening in Pennsylvania can happen in your state, too.

Resource Materials

The Pennsylvania State Department of Education has been inundated with requests for material on its activities and in spite of frequent reprints has not been able to respond to all out-of-state requests, particularly those for multiple copies. All material is in the public domain, however, and may be copied for use by interested citizen groups or school systems. With this caveat, then, requests for general information and/or single copies of the following resources may be obtained by writing to the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Office of Equal Rights, Basic Education Division (for K-12 programs) or Higher Education Division (for junior college and university programs), Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

SEXISM IN EDUCATION, THE JOINT TASK FORCE REPORT. 1972

IMAGES OF WOMEN: A Bibliography of Feminist Resources for Pennsylvania Schools, (4 printing) Publishing Department of the State Department of Education. 1973

TRAINING THE WOMAN TO KNOW HER PLACE: The Social Antecedents of Women in the World of Work. 1973

Self-Study Guide to Sexism in the Schools.

EQUAL RIGHTS: An Intergroup Education Curriculum.

APPENDIX A

WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY-MAKING
DENVER, COLORADO
JANUARY 23-25, 1974

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

Ms. Cecilia Cosca
U.S. Civil Rights Commission
1121 Vermont Avenue, NW, Room 401
Washington, DC

Ms. Arvonne Fraser, President
Women's Equity Action League
National Press Building, Room 538
Washington, DC 20004

Ms. Anne Grant
NOW-Education Committee
28 East 56th Street
New York, New York 10022

Ms. Margaret Jones
National Foundation for the
Improvement of Education
1507 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Elizabeth Koontz
Coordinator for Nutritional
Programs
North Carolina State Department
of Human Resources
Albemarle Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Ms. Carmen Maymi, Director
Women's Bureau
U.S. Department of Labor
14th and Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20010

Ms. Shirley McCune
Manager, Teacher Rights Division
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Ms. Gail T. McLure
American College Testing Program
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Dr. John McLure
Department of Education
408 Jefferson Building
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Ms. Terry Saario
The Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd Street
New York, New York

Ms. Joan Thompson
Federal Women's Program
Office of Education, Room 2049
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

## PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Yvonne M. Agazarian
Savi Communications
1831 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Ms. Sally V. Allen, Director
Early Childhood Project
Education Commission of the
States
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Jean L. Ambrose
Assistant to Dean
Douglass College and Chairperson
Women's Rights Task Force on
Education of New Jersey N.O.W.
549 Lenox Avenue
Westfield, New Jersey 07090

Susan Groves Bement, Director
Woman's Studies Program
Berkeley Unified School District
1720 Oregon Street
Berkeley, California 94703

Ms. Marj Britt
Director of Curriculum Development
The Feminist Press
Box 334
Old Westbury, New York 11568

Ms. Gwyneth Britton
Assistant Professor
School of Education
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Blandina (Bambi) Cardenas
Vice-Chairperson
NEA, Human Relations Council
Vice-President
Inter-Cultural Laboratories
San Antonio, Texas

Dr. Patricia Chesebro
Associate Professor of Psychology
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761

Constance E. Cook
Member of New York State Assembly
Chairwoman
Assembly Education Committee
209 Coy Glen Road
Ithaca, New York 14850

Margaret C. Dunkle
Project Associate
Project on the Status &
Education of Women
Association of American
Colleges
1818 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Ms. Catherine East
Executive Secretary
Citizens Advisory Council on the
Status of Women
Department of Labor Building
Room 1236
Washington, DC 20210

Judith B. Edwards
Research Assistant
Iowa Testing Program
220 Lindquist Center for
Measurement
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Dr. Cecilia Foxley (position paper)
Affirmative Action Program
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Mrs. Jessie Gomez Franco
Assistant Principal
Instruction and Curriculum
Nightingale Junior High School
3311 North Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, California

Margaret Gates
Co-Director
Center for Women Policy Studies
2000 P Street, Suite 508
Washington, DC 20036

Mrs. Karen A. Hone
Administrative Assistant
Education Commission
of the States
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Florence Howe
Professor of Humanities
Suny-College at Old Westbury
President, The Feminist Press
and the Clearinghouse on
Women's Studies
Editor, The Women's Studies
Newsletter
Box 210
Westbury, L.I., New York 11568

Ms. Margaret Jones
National Foundation for the
Improvement of Education
1507 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Joyce Kaser
Chairer, Dayton Schools
Women's Rights Committee, 1972-73
348 West First Street
Room 1473 Annex
Dayton, Ohio

Dr. Eileen Kelly
Associate in Education Research
New York State Education Department
Coordinator, New York State National
Organization for Women
98 South Pine Avenue
Albany, New York 12208

Ms. Lourdes Miranda King
President
L. Miranda and Associates
3502 Taylor Street
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015

Dr. John McLure
Department of Education
408 Jefferson Building
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Holly Knox
Director
Project on Equal Education
Rights (PEER)
1522 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Martha Matthews
Project Coordinator
Resource Center on Sex Roles
in Education
National Foundation for the
Improvement of Education
1156 - 15th Street, NW, Suite 918
Washington, DC 20005

Ms. Lucile Musmanno
Research Associate
Education Finance Project
Research and Information Services
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Sharon L. Menard
National Organization for
Women
Educational Task Force
Boulder Chapter
Colorado N.O.W.
State Board Member
2348 North 107 Street
Lafayette, Colorado 80026

Dr. Shirley McCune
Manager, Teacher Rights
National Education Association
1201 - 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. John McClusky
Department of Political Science
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Dr. Marilyn B. Neidig
Assistant Professor of Educational Administration
University of South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota 57069

Dr. Ruth M. Oltman
Dean of Graduate Program
Hood College
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Ms. Virginia Paul
Reading Specialist
Clover Park School District
11701 Interlaaken Drive, SW
Tacoma, Washington 98498

Carolyn I. Polowy
Attorney; Legal Head-Women's Equity Action League
Consultant to the Center for Women Policy Studies
2000 P Street, NW, Suite 508
Washington, DC 20036

Pam Root
Associate Supervisor
Equal Educational Opportunity
Supt. Public Instruction
State of Washington
Executive Director Task Force on Women and Girls in Education
Old Capitol Building
Olympia, Washington 98504

Dr. Paula Silver
Associate Director
University Council for Educational Administration
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dr. Anita Simon, Director
Humanizing Learning Program
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19130

Joan Thompson
Federal Women's Program
Office of Education, Room 2049
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20520

Jean A. Wells
Special Assistant to the Director
Women's Bureau
Employment Standards Administration
U.S. Department of Labor
Washington, DC 20210

Elizabeth C. Wilson
Consultant Curriculum
Montgomery County Public Schools
850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland

Dr. Sara Goodman Zimet
Assistant Professor of Psychology
University of Colorado
Medical Center
4200 East 9th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80220

STAFF:

Margery Thompson
Conference Coordinator and Editor
3400 Dent Place, NW
Washington, DC 20007

June Frank
Conference Secretary
Institute for Educational
Leadership
George Washington University
1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW #310
Washington, DC 20036

Mr. E. Joseph Schneider
1518 K Street, NW, Suite 206
Washington, DC

Maggie Kennedy Burton
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 775
Denver, Colorado 80203

GUEST SPEAKER:

Dr. Wendell Pierce
Education Commission of the
States
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

APPENDIX B

732 Garland
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008
May 29, 1973

Mr. Caspar Weinberger, Secretary
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Please consider this letter a formal complaint under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. P.L. 92-318. The complaint is directed at the Board of Education of the Kalamazoo Public Schools, Kalamazoo, Michigan. It is filed by the Committee to Study Sex Discrimination in the Kalamazoo Public Schools. I am the chairperson of that committee and am filing this complaint on its behalf. The committee was created by the Board of Education in December of 1971 to do a comprehensive study of sex discrimination in the school system.

On May 21, 1973, the Kalamazoo Board of Education adopted the Houghton-Mifflin Reading Program for grades one through six throughout the entire Kalamazoo school system. This program utilizes 12 books. The total cost of the program is $60,000, of which $30,000 will come from state and/or Federal funds. The program will result in the purchase of thousands of books which will be in use in the Kalamazoo school system for an estimated five years by successive groups of children. The content, illustrations, emphasis, philosophy and attitudes displayed in the books in this reading program discriminate against girls and women.

We allege that this action of the Board subjects the girls in the elementary grades in Kalamazoo to discrimination under an education program receiving Federal financial assistance within the meaning of Section 901(a) of Title IX. As of February, 1973, according to the best information available to us, the Kalamazoo Public Schools were receiving assistance from 10 grants, totaling $2,133,516.83. We

request an immediate HEW investigation which would first explore the possibilities of persuading the Board to comply voluntarily with the law by using instead a non-sexist reading program. Failing that, we request that all Federal assistance to the Kalamazoo school system be suspended until the Board does comply with Title IX.

Sincerely,

/s/ Jo Jacobs
Chairperson
On behalf of the Committee
to Study Sex Discrimination
in the Kalamazoo Public Schools

Enclosure:
Preliminary findings

Discussion of Preliminary Findings
Committee to Study Sex Discrimination in the
Kalamazoo Public Schools

Grade school readers are a top priority area for change, since they influence children at their most vulnerable and malleable stage of development.

Textbooks should treat women as the equals of men. Although in the past women were regarded as inferior, they were not and are not inferior people. The sexist attitudes of the past should not be reflected in current publications.

Preliminary Statement

The findings below reflect the preliminary results of an examination of the reading program adopted by the Kalamazoo schools on May 21, 1973. The examination took place between May 10, when program materials first became available to us, and May 14, when we submitted a report to the Board of Education. Examination of these materials is continuing, and a detailed report will be available soon. When the final report is issued, we plan to file an amended complaint with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, further documenting our charges.

Initial Findings

The reading program is a major part of elementary school education, one in which children participate every school day for six years. The schools fail to serve the needs of students, both boys and girls, when they adopt a reading program which incorporates a massive amount of sex-role stereotyping and a totally inadequate and unrealistic portrait of the performance and potential of women in American society.

1. A reading program which does not recognize the actions and achievements of women is an education program which is sex discriminatory.

The Houghton-Mifflin sixth grade reader, just adopted by the Kalamazoo schools, features seven famous men and one girl; it mentions an additional twenty-nine famous men and two famous women.

2. A reading program which does not show the same respect for women and girls as it does for men and boys is an education program which is sex discriminatory.

We found that of the stories in the entire Houghton-Mifflin Reading Program that could be identified as having either male or female leading characters, approximately 80 percent had male leading characters, although females make up at least 50 percent of the elementary school population.

In the first pre-primer, all of the leading characters are boys. A girl first appears on page 21 with a mop in her hand and is definitely a subordinate character. The pronouns he and it appear in the first and second pre-primers; the pronoun she does not appear in the series until the third pre-primer.

Of the ten stories in Secrets, a second-grade reader, five have leading characters who are human and four have leading characters who are animals. All of the human leading characters are male; girls are hardly even mentioned. In the fifth-grade reader, there are more stories about animals than about girls and women.

One example from the fifth-grade reader which shows a lack of respect for females simply because they are females is this quotation:

> "What is square and has bats in the belfry?" Dusty grinned.
>
> "That's easy, Scruggs--girls!"

3. A reading program which assigns abilities, traits, interests, and activities on the basis of male or female stereotypes is an education program that is sex discriminatory.

Adult role models for girls in the Houghton-Mifflin Reading Program are limited. Women are portrayed predominantly as mothers, nurses, librarians, storekeepers, with few other roles. Men are portrayed in many occupations, including doctors, lawyers, bus drivers, mayors, policemen, scientists, firemen, grocers, industrialists, kings, town watchmen, soldiers, inventors, builders, violinists, farmers, political scientists, university department heads, milkmen, sanitation men, hunters, spies, writers, artists, engineers, sheriffs, plumbers, carpenters, treasure divers, sculpters, spacemen, sailors, judges and F.B.I. men.

A specific example of this inequity is the full list of occupations illustrated in the second grade reader:

| Men | Women |
|---|---|
| Zoo keeper | Mother |
| Fence painter | Circus fat lady |
| Circus clown | Elementary school teacher |
| Circus tall man | Nurse |
| Circus strong man | |
| Flower cart owner/seller | |
| Flower shop owner | |
| Toy shop owner | |
| Policeman | |
| Truck driver | |
| Milkman | |
| Grocer | |
| Scientist | |
| Doctor | |

The mothers in the readers work almost exclusively at home. The few mothers shown or described who are in the work force outside the home are generally in unspecified jobs. Yet the 1970 Census for the City of Kalamazoo shows that 41.3 percent of the women of this city over the age of 16 are employed outside the home.

We contend that the sex roles presented in this reading program reflect the restricted range of occupations and behavior permitted women in American society before sex discrimination became illegal. One of the principal functions of the American public school system is to enable our children to obtain employment appropriate to their potential. The elimination and prevention of discrimination in employment, based on race, religion, national origin, sex or any other extraneous factor, is a commitment that has been repeatedly affirmed by various Federal statutes. To declare that girls should be assured the same opportunities for employment upon graduation as boys is a principle that few will any longer dispute. But to subject girls before graduation to years of careful conditioning that discourages them from considering certain occupational roles is to make a mockery of that principle.

Importance of the Findings

The elementary school with its educational programs is an important agency of socialization. The learning it provides about role models and expectations is influential in the life planning of students and is the major supplement provided by society to the socialization experienced by children in the home. Thus, the portrayal of goals labeled socially desirable and limits said to be set by the social order in a reading program is of critical importance in influencing the ideas and expectations of children about the quality and extent of the participation in American life of girls and women.

**EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM (EPFP)** (formerly Washington Internships in Education) is a national program designed to help provide future leaders the skills in policy-making they must have to exert effective and enlightened leadership in American education. Funds for the program are provided by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations.

Since 1965, the program has placed over 250 mid-career persons in one-year internships in public and private agencies involved in educational policy matters. Carefully recruited sponsors, who are themselves key actors in public policy issues, agree to serve as on-the-job mentors by demonstrating, through their daily tasks, how educational policy is shaped at the State or national level. An important ingredient of the program is the informal weekly seminars through which Fellows interact with decision-makers, eminent authorities and leading specialists in education-related fields. National meetings of Fellows with other special groups contribute further to their understanding of educational policy-making. Fellows' salaries are paid by the sponsoring organizations, while the costs of recruitment, placement and continuing professional development are borne by the EPF Program. Headquartered in Washington with sites in four States, the EPF Program is designed for mid-career persons 25-45 years of age who have completed their academic training. Two-thirds of the forty-five participants in 1975-76 have completed the doctorate degree; all have demonstrated substantial leadership skills and a strong commitment to improving the educational system.

Although EPFP participants are widely considered to be prime candidates for excellent post-Fellowship positions, the EPF Program does not commit itself to obtaining future employment for them. Fellows frequently take leaves of absence from their pre-Fellowship position to participate in the program.

Illinois Coordinator—Robert Bunnell
Massachusetts Coordinator—Ursula Wagener
Michigan Coordinators—Carl Candoli & Matthew Prophet

**EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR (ESS)** is a professional development program designed for staff members employed by the Executive and Legislative branches of the Federal Government in the field of education. The goals of ESS are to provide an open forum in which participants can improve their professional capabilities and personal fulfillment on the job by:

a) being exposed to new ideas and perspectives;
b) increasing their knowledge of particular subjects and their understanding of how things actually operate in the field; and
c) meeting with other professionals involved in the legislative and policy formulation processes in an informal learning environment which fosters improved professional relationships.

ESS supplements the Washington work experience with a variety of in-service training seminars and in-the-field observation. It was established in 1969 and is funded by the Institute and by partial reimbursement from the governmental agencies served.

In fiscal year 1975, ESS conducted 73 programs for over 2200 Federal employees. Included were 16 field trips and 57 luncheon/dinner discussion meetings, site visits, demonstrations, and other executive development activities.

**THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM (TAP)** is an evolving IEL activity whose emphasis up to now has been the provision of seminars and other forums for legislators and other policy-makers at State capitals. Begun in 1972 with three State educational seminars, TAP now sponsors 21 seminars, all manned by Associates who, on a part-time basis, arrange 6-10 programs annually.

Other TAP efforts—

Maintain a network of State-level "generalists" (Associates) whose ties to IEL in the nation's capital provide rare linkages among Federal and State education policy-setters.

Encourage similar linkages among agencies and coalitions seeking to improve processes of State-level decision-making.

Support attempts of individual State leaders (governors, chief state school officers, legislative committees, etc.) to improve policy-making machinery and to narrow the communications gap which separates political and professional leaders.

## OTHER IEL ACTIVITIES

Under a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, IEL has established an issue development service for consideration and transmission of key policy issues in postsecondary education. The **POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY (PECA)** sponsors conferences, research efforts, task force groups and publications focusing on such issues as institutional licensing, consumer protection, and State financing. During 1975-76 the program will add lifelong learning and public policy to its agenda.

IEL and National Public Radio co-produce the **"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION"** series, heard weekly over NPR's 179 member stations from coast to coast. Voice of America rebroadcasts the 1-hour programs, and IEL makes cassettes and transcripts available at minimum cost. In 1974 "Options" received awards from the Education Writers Association and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, Mason-Dixon Division. Funds for "Options in Education" are provided by IEL, National Institute of Education, U.S. Office of Education, Robert S. Clark Foundation, NPR, and other grantors.

Under contract from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, HEW, IEL is planning major conference activity early in 1976 for educational decision-makers and administrators on the subject of institutional adjustment to changing sex roles. The goals of the **NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION**, which include increasing training and career options for women in education and facilitating Title IX implementation, will be pursued in cooperation with women's group leaders, policy-makers and the educational community generally.

The **CAREER EDUCATION POLICY PROJECT (CEPP)** addresses the issues of education, work and society. Funded by the U.S. Office of Education, CEPP uses the resources of other IEL programs—ESS, TAP, "Option"—to inform both policy-makers and the public of the issues in the career education movement.